ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED002091	N.A.	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S): Record, Wilson

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:

Changing Attitudes of School Personnel

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Integrated Education Issue II

7. EDITOR(S):	8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
Weinberg, Meyer	Southern Illinois
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE	ORG. University
Integrated Education Associates	ST. Carbondale, Illinois
343 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.	CITY, STATE
	TELE. EXT.
	INST/LOC CODE

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
II	26-43	May 64	18

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA	15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
	Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

	de facto segregation		minority attitudes
teacher attitudes	school policy		community power
discriminating attitudes	educational boards		school personnel
school integration	civil rights		community influences

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

More than in almost any other professional group, the attitudes of school personnel are influenced by community factors. General attitudes of white publics will certainly be significant for specific attitudes of school personnel toward integration. Most school personnel are members of the middle class; their class values and status concerns enter into their confrontation with integration issues. Of major concern is school principals', teachers', and counselors' lack of encounter with members of racial and ethnic minorities as equals and as participants in shaping the activities of the school. The attitudes of school personnel are not easily changed, but they are not irretrievably fixed. To facilitate integration in public schools, educators should identify those attitudes which are detrimental to public principles of equal educational opportunities and seek to modify them.

An analysis is presented of the specific attitudes and types of individuals found among school personnel-school board members, teachers, administrators, and counselors.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ployed Negro servants and nurses, and the relationship was kindly and pleasant on both sides—provided always that no one raised the issue of equality. White people patronized the shops and stores Negroes ran, provided only whites were served. Negro clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and teachers worked only among their own people. If Negroes made no attempt to change this system there was usually no trouble." (p. 251)

TWENTIETH-CENTURY NEGROES:

Negroes are scanted in the second half of the text; and there is no recognition of the importance of post Civil War racial conflict. With the exception of Jack Johnson and Joe Louis, the boxers, no Negro is mentioned nor are Negro problems noted until post-World War II America is treated. The problem Negroes faced in getting a living in the post-war period are only acknowledged. Negro sharecroppers are singled out as a deprived group, and the text notes that President Truman's Civil Rights Commission reported "that a good many Americans still found their color, their religion, or their national origin a barrier to bettering their social and economic positions." Civil rights, the text suggests, remained a crucial issue.

Finally, the Brown Case gets adequate treatment in the book. The decision is briefly described and Southern resistence is noted. Unfortunately the Brown case is treated without any reference to earlier Court cases; and the discussion fails to mention either the court's contention that separate facilities are inherently inequal or its use of sociological data.

Robert L. Middlekauff

ED002091

CHANGING ATTITUDES OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

Wilson Record

A paper delivered at the Tenth Symposium on Race and Education, Michigan State University, May, 1964. Reprinted by permission of the author. All papers of the Symposium are to be published in the printed proceedings, by Michigan State University. The author is Professor of Sociology at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

get

I

One cannot speak of the attitudes of school personnel without qualification, because what school people think about race or any other issue is subject to wide individual variation. But though attitudes have not been uniform, it is safe to say that on the whole school board members, administrators, teachers and counselors have been entirely too slow in facing squarely the racial inequities in the American educational system. On this score educators have failed the moral and professional commitment of their calling.

We live in a society which increasingly prescribes education as the passport into the economy, the polity, and the community. Yet the people who run our schools—and therefore serve as guardians of the passport—have been remiss in equalizing the opportunity for acquiring it. By their default educators must accept a large share of the responsibility for narrowing the life chances of perhaps twenty per cent of the nation's children.

Understanding the attitudes of school personnel—the circumstances in which they have developed and the manner in which they may be changed—is essential for achieving the goals of a democratic educational philosophy, clearly enunciated by the Supreme Court a decade ago. Had such understanding and its application as public policy been realized during the long and dreary interval since 1954, integration of public schools would be much closer. I do not wish to overestimate the influence that school personnel of even the most dedicated and fairminded sort could have exerted over the many forces—habit, custom, confusion, and bigotry—that stood in the way of integrated education. But one senses both moral defection and professional failure in the

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

get figures

responses of most school personnel to the critical, line-drawing issues brought to the fore by the court's decision, issues voiced time and again, in clear and ringing terms, in community after community, north and south, east and west, by the education-denied and the freedom-deprived groups seeking to claim an American birthright.

Rarely did public school personnel themselves initiate the protests and the court cases which over a period of some three decades prior to 1954 chipped away at racially segregated education. They were forced to confront the issues; they did not seek them out. With few exceptions they not only accepted but virtually approved segregated schooling. In doing so they became instruments for propping up a racist society. School men appeared before the bar not as friends of the court intervening in behalf of education-denied Negroes but as defendants of the established order, which their own public schools helped create and now fought to uphold. Future historians looking back on the racial conflicts in education during the past few decades will express bewilderment at the tragic gap between the moral and professional ideals of school personnel on the one hand and their day-to-day and year-to-year actions on the other. Chronicles will record the opportunity lost, the time dissipated, and the humanity wasted. Some historians will footnote —perhaps some novelist will portray in depth—the case of the Negro child who in 1954 entered first grade in a segregated institution, in Chicago or New York or Atlanta, and a decade later terminated his formal schooling without ever having been part of an integrated classroom, without even experiencing adequate instruction which could mean the difference between his becoming an autonomous man or a dependent drudge in an ever more complex society. Tragedy is the result in the individual case; catastrophe, threatening the whole structure of democratic society, is the inevitable outcome when literally millions of young Negroes suffer the same fate; when millions more will suffer it in the future unless educators bestir themselves—here and now.

Even after the 1954 ruling, most public school personnel assumed a "wait and see" stance usually proclaiming that in their schools there was no prejudice, no discrimination, no inequities based on race. Presumably the problem of segregated schooling was found only in the South —not in the North, or East, or West —and certainly not in this city nor in *this* system. Such "*imbalances*" as might exist were written off as a result of time and circumstance, of forces—social, economic, and political —lying entirely outside the school system. Reviewing developments in the immediate post-decision years, one cannot avoid being shocked by the extent to which many school personnel were willing to use delaying tactics in the administrative and judicial arenas and to collaborate with those who wished to perpetuate segregated schools as features of the local social landscape. The many hearings conducted by the Civil Rights Commission contain convincing, overwhelming evidence that these were not isolated practices resulting from distinctive local conditions but characteristic responses of school personnel across the land. The few instances where school people led the fight for equality of opportunity stand out precisely because they are so few and because they have received so much hopeful public notice. One searches almost in vain for examples of school personnel recognizing their responsibilities in the light of the court decision and taking the initative to do what they were best equipped in the circumstances to do: educate themselves, the various publics and their classroom pupils toward the fulfillment of long-neglected obligations.

Many educators today express bewilderment that their position and effort are not greater appreciated by education-denied groups, especially Negroes, in whose behalf they claimed to have labored long. Their responses are similar to those of the Southern white man who cannot understand why Negroes don't love him for his many sacrifices in their behalf. This white-collar patroniza-

tion, however, only underscores the schoolman's failure to understand the nature and depth of the Negro's feeling about education, and his determination to become a full citizen by acquiring and using it. The paternalistic attitudes of administrators, teachers, and counselors can but add insult to the deep injury suffered through the centuries by Negroes in American society.

In school integration Negroes are looking for results, not excuses; for actions, not declarations of good intent; for substance, not form. Their skepticism, indeed their mistrust, of school personnel would be substantially less if even now there was clear evidence that the latter understood their problem and on that basis were doing something about it. But what has been the occasion for school action? What lies behind it? More often than not it is the court order, the protest march, the integration rally, the school boycott, perhaps the death of a demonstrator protesting the erection of still another segregated school. It is to fear, to a display of power, that schoolmen have responded. There was a time when Negroes might have appealed to the educators' idealism but no more, no more. Negroes have come to feel that persuasion and negotiation unsupported by organized pressure will produce few changes. The Negro's high regard for education on the one hand and his distrust of

> I realize that many of you are in school districts where *segregation* is not an issue. But *integration* is an issue wherever there are people —and the obligation to see that the students in your schools are prepared to live in an integrated society exists wherever you may be serving as a board member.
>
> —James E. Allen, Jr.

educators on the other are clearly evident in the thrust of his pressure and in the tactics he is choosing to break through racial barriers in public schools. To the schoolmen's plea to wait and hope the Negro's reply is that he has waited too long already, and that hope was long ago betrayed by those who could have given it substance.

The foregoing remarks are not an indictment of all educators; there have been happy exceptions. Nor do I take the position that the attitude of the majority cannot be changed. If I thought the educators could not be educated, I would not be here, particularly in this panel discussion. I believe that attitudes are flexible. Furthermore, I am persuaded that even where attitudes of school personnel and other factors in the integration drama cannot be changed fundamentally, their behavioral consequences can be substantially redirected toward socially approved and morally justified ends.

However, the resources of education-denied groups in realizing their aims cannot be tapped readily because of mistrust and the continuing evasion of integration by school personnel. Public schoolmen have not only a past to live down but a professional creed, so clearly implied in the court decision, to live up to.

II

Attitudes are the creatures of many forces—personal, professional, organizational, and situational—which form the context within which school personnel develop and carry on their specialized tasks. Only if the social, interpersonal, and structural elements in the perspectives of school functionaries are carefully explored can one assay attitudes realistically, or take steps to change them. Focus on attitudes as such is not likely to be rewarding. Even if change is possible, it may take so long that the attack on critical problems in school integration will be tragically postponed and the damage to minority children proliferated. Few school personnel are likely to be struck blind by some great light and, upon recovering, to view school integration in a radically different perspective. And we are no more likely to change their behavior in the future simply by pleading for a change of heart, however desirable that may be as a final condition, than we have been in the past.

The context within the attitudes of school personnel are formed and altered is invariably complex. It is true that in each administrator, each teacher, each counselor resides a unique person, who brings to his encounter with associates and pupils a psychological make-up different from all others in the past and never to be duplicated in the future. It is equally true however, that individual diversity is limited by the social context in which it exists. The individual educator is a member of a particular class, a particular race, a particular age group, a particular geographical community which shape and delimit his perspective. The high order of uniformity in the response of schoolmen to the challenge of the color problem is attributable to the fact that they are concentrated in certain social groupings rather than being distributed evenly over the various ranges. The men who run our schools are predominantly middle-aged, middle-class white men.

More than in almost any other professional group, the attitudes of school personnel are influenced by community forces. Administrators, teachers, and counselors are all public employees working in public institution into which a substantial portion of public resources have been poured. Moreover, they are engaged in a vital task, the socialization of the young, whose importance all publics within the community recognize, however much they may disagree on the goals and methods of socialization.

The way school personnel identify the crucial elements of the community will have an important bearing on their conceptions of professional roles, suggesting the limits and forms of change in the schools. Accuracy in definition of the social structure is not readily attained, however. The difficulty of getting essential information and the frequent inability of school personnel to analyze and assimilate it are two barriers, though not necessarily the most important ones; definitions of reality are as much the result of social pressure and emotion as they are of fact and reason. And men, even school men, have been know to deny the existence of what they do not understand, and to proclaim the impossibility of what they do not desire.

In the appraisal of community structures, as a step in changing attitudes of school personnel, sociologists can make a contribution by calling studied attention to the general historical experience of whites and members of racial and ethnic minorities. The aim is not to produce an "accepted" or an official account but to identify those occurrences in the past which bear on present issues and to develop a perspective not unduly pessimistic or optimistic. Changes making for social cohesion and social conflict in intergroup relations can be identified and the possibilities of purposeful change can be scaled against past experience.

Many school personnel are not history-conscious and perhaps should not be expected to be so. There is a strong tendency to assume that race relations patterns are fixed and that what is so firmly rooted in the past cannot be modified. Yet the reader of Woodward's *Strange Career of Jim Crow* or of Logan's *The Negro in American Life and Thought* cannot help being struck by the fact that post-civil war patterns of racial segregation were wilfully imposed by powerful white men frequently against the inclinations of other whites and certainly against that of Negroes. Furthermore, we already have in hand a sufficient number of cases of accomplished integration to lend hope to those who would now reduce the heavy levy of history upon the present.

History, I am suggesting, particularly the history of race relations in the local community, can be an instrument for integration of public schools. But it will be useful primarily by indirection, by the way in which it enables school personnel to identify the community and to discern those unique openings through which equitable education opportunities can be initiated.

Sociologists can also interpret for school personnel those mechanisms

in the community through which groups assert their interests and seek to control the behavior of their own members as well as that of others. Attitudes of school personnel toward integration depend in part on an assessment of the social forces at play, their components, form, and strength. To say that school men, although they may have had courses in sociology and long experience in the community, understand those forces only slightly is not unfair. They are likely to be conscious of only the more public and articulate forces, ignoring the informal and non-aggressive ones. Thus they miss opportunities to obtain different perspectives on race relations; they fail to tap new and possibly useful resources for integration. For example, I have encountered few educators who were knowledgeable about the church in the Negro community or who saw any possibility of using its resources in solving administrative, teaching, and counseling problems. I have interviewed few counselors who were familiar with the local minority labor market, who saw its limitations and possibilities and its significance for the behavior of their Negro counselees. Moreover, those who have worked with school personnel must be impressed by their unawareness of the roles of other official agencies whose activities have a significant bearing on any move towards school integration.

What I am especially concerned about is the lack of encounter of school principals, teachers and counselors with members of racial and ethnic minorities on the level of equality and as participants in shaping the activities of the school. Such encounters may not produce understanding or good will, but they do have the possibility, much more than do textbooks or administrative rules, of changing attitudes, of forcing the professional to ask again: Who am I? What am I doing here? What ought I to do?

Sociologists can describe the "community power structure," a concept widely used in recent years by civil rights organizations directing their efforts at those groups who heavily influence public policies and public events. How centralized or diffused, how rigid or flexible, how static or changing, how exclusive or representative—these are questions about community power that must be answered by those who would integrate public schools. Wherever public schools are found one finds also the practice of politics and the use of power. School personnel to varying degrees are aware of it, administrators probably more than teachers, and teachers more than counselors. In spite of their claims to the contrary, professional school men are more than the instruments of power directed from the community. They are themselves political actors; they not only respond to but also exercise power. For example, the school administrator who seeks out and uses the advice of a civil rights organization enhances the organization's influence and prestige in the community. This is an exercise of judgment that has specific consequences and direct implications for the patterns of influence and control extending beyond the school.

General attitudes of white publics will certainly be significant for specific attitudes of school personnel toward integration. Most school people are white and upon them falls the responsibility of applying policies at the pay-off place: in the school itself, and in the classroom. Most school personnel are also middle-class, if not in origin then certainly in outlook; their class values and status concerns enter into their confrontation of integration issues.

> The neighborhood school: "The nearer Negroes get to it, the more sacred it becomes."
> —Dan W. Dodson, February, 1963

There has been a pronounced tendency for them to assume that other white public attitudes are all of a piece and, possibly, like their own underlying feelings, negative. Such is not the case, of course. In protesting school segregation in community after community outside the South, Negroes have received firm support from predominantly white religious, political

and educational organizations; in California, for example, from the Episcopal Youth, the Young Democrats, and the American Federation of Teachers.

The skillful use of favorable sentiment among white publics would greatly strengthen school personnel in communities moving toward integrated education. It emphasizes that they do not stand alone and that there are resources on which they can draw. Attitudes, for better or worse, are not granite-like things embedded in the individual and durable until death; they are weakened or strengthened to large degree by the response of other people whom the individual encounters in carrying on his activities, personal, social and professional. The success of a school integration program, however, rests importantly upon the initial attitudes of school people—their convictions and willingness to risk social disapproval and public criticism. But there is now, more than at any time since the Supreme Court decision, a need for white publics to stand up and be counted, to support school people who, either boldly or timidly, are moving toward integration. The vague resolution about brotherhood, the hopeful declaration that the problem will eventually be solved, the pious appeal to sacred traditions, the appointment of still another study commission are not enough.

Recently a number of counter movements to integrated education have attracted considerable attention in urban communities outside the South. Their form and strength, exemplified by the one in New York City opposing even the modest desegregation program of Superintendent Gross, have been interpreted by some as a rejection of the principle of integrated education and a marked shift in white attitudes from indifference to hostility. School personnel no doubt have been impressed by these developments, their enthusiasm dampened or their skepticism confirmed. However, I suggest that the main fears of participants in counter movements may not be integration *per se* but a consequent decline in the quality of education, which is something quite different. Integrated education *need not* be and *must not* be inferior. And the answer to such misgivings is not more racially segregated education, which in practice is inferior, but improvement of instruction across the board and a raising quality of learning for all pupils.

School integration efforts must take into account the attitudes of people who man health, welfare, employment, law enforcement, housing, planning and other public organizations. Here again public servants reflect a wide range of attitudes toward school integration. Enthusiastic cooperation of other public agencies with the schools would be of course, a fortunate development. Rarely has it been achieved, for reasons which cannot be fully explored here. The Balkanization of public agencies in urban communities, the emergence of small bureaucratic enclaves with limited responsibility and limited imagination, is an underlying cause. However, these agencies are here, and they will remain for a long time. Certainly, integrated education cannot await a rational consolidation of public units. The wait would be long indeed.

There is not only non-cooperation among agencies; much of the time open conflict occurs. Schools are at odds with probation departments about keeping delinquents in the classrooms. Employment services are angry with schools for encroaching on placement functions. Recreation departments feel the schools are against extension of recreational programs to include adult education; and so on. Yet, we know that problems of segregated education cannot best be attacked by the schools alone; it is not enough to reduce the hostility of other agencies to neutrality; the complexities of the problems demand a concerted effort.

School personnel themselves are participants in a bureaucratic system and identified closely with it. They are apt to think first of a proposed program's significance for the school's relations with police, health, welfare and so on. Predominant here is the bureaucratic and organizational attitude, with moral and professional concerns receding into the back-

ground. Hesitation and timidity will be the prominent responses of school personnel wishing to avoid the risks inherent in a bold integration program. Other agencies might take advantage of unfavorable reactions and exploit them to *their* advantage.

However, there are some developments weakening bureaucratic rigidities and hesitant attitudes of personnel. The public school is not the only agency being forced to change its ways. The employment service is having to curtail racial discrimination in referrals and hiring; the police department is having to modify the handling of Negro offenders and the recruiting of new members to the force; the recreation department is having to integrate its playground and swimming pools, and so on. The Supreme Court decision, by general implication and by subsequent interpretation in specific cases, applies not only to the South but to the nation, not only to schools but to other public agencies.

The primary battleground, however, has been the schools. School people have not only the greatest resources but the largest experience. They are in a strategic position not only to seek *from* but provide support *to* other agencies groping toward integrated policies. By modifying the bureaucratic attitude school personnel may approach probation, recreation, police and other people and develop a mutual attack on the mutual problem of desegregation of the whole community. It is no compliment to school officials to record that in many cases the initative has come from other agencies. In one large San Francisco Bay Area city, for example, the chief of police, not the superintendent of schools, is the one who has taken *Brown vs. Board of Education* seriously and reorganized his program along integrated lines. In the final analysis, the real enemy of school personnel is not members of other public agencies but segregation itself. Those who purport to instruct the young, all the young—to teach, if you will—cannot afford to let their own bureaucratic attitudes obscure the difference.

III

I turn now to some of the more specific attitudes of school personnel, recognizing again that attitudes vary rather widely and are to no small degree shaped by the functional position of the individual within the school system.

There are four broad categories of personnel—board members, administrators, teachers, and counselors—whose attitudes are significant for integration efforts. An examination in depth of each typical attitude within each category would be highly desirable. Obviously, however, this cannot be attempted in the space available. Accordingly, I shall be somewhat arbitrary in dealing with the few that seem to me most important.

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

School board members are in key positions to initiate integration programs. Their support is essential in establishing the broad general policies out of which develop precise moves such as the change of attendance boundaries, the construction of new schools, and the development of special resources and services.

The attitudes they bring to the integration issue are not only varied but frequently ill-defined and poorly expressed. But board members are at least public-minded people with more than average concern with happenings in the schools. They can observe school problems directly and draw upon a wealth of official material and advice not ordinarily available to the layman. Even so, board members in community after community have shown a marked lack of sensitivity to the integration issue and a deplorable inability to grasp the feelings of Negroes about local education problems. Especially is this true in places to which large numbers of Negroes have migrated during the past two decades. For examples, local board members frequently propose erection of new schools in Negro ghettoes, assuming that Negroes will be content with the new physical plant and appreciative of the board's effort. Or they recommend the appointment of more Negro teachers—and then assign them to predominantly Negro schools. Or they provide a

woefully inadequate fund for "compensatory" education programs in ghetto areas. Or they obtain grants from private foundations for bold, experimental programs that are neither bold nor experimental but usually only timid gestures financed from windfall budgets and doomed to end once those funds are no longer available. Each of these moves may be an improvement, but neither separately nor collectively do they seriously bridge the underlying pattern of segregated education; they leave untouched what many Negroes regard as the basic cause of distress.

But board members in non-Southern communities, however, cannot continue to plead lack of knowledge about the consequences of segregated education or lack of understanding of Negro grievances. The available data on both issues are substantial—and convincing for those willing to examine them carefully.

We must then look elsewhere in assessing the failure of many school board members to act effectively in equalizing education opportunities. Again we come back to the basic attitudes of board members. We should not minimize the school boards' inclusion of people who are bitterly opposed to integration in any form, certainly in the schools. We help none when we account for this attitude as a "lack of understanding" or as a "failure to communicate." These board members, the "bitter-enders," understand all too well and communicate all too clearly.

"Bitter-enders" are not necessarily a small, vocal minority. In some communities they monopolize board positions and in effect control the school system. In others they form an influential "bloc" and severely limit what the majority may wish to do about segregation and related problems.

The "bitter-ender" publicly justifies his attitude through assertions about race and education that are at once familiar and frightening; familiar because they have been used for decades to support inequality and frightening because they are so inappropriate for the deepening education crisis and can but further inflame an already smoldering issue. "Negroes," he says, "are really not capable of high educational achievement and there is little point in providing better facilities and instruction. They are happier where they are and do not really want to attend integrated schools. In them they would be out of place and feel uncomfortable and would still be segregated on the basis of performance and ability. The causes of unrest among Negroes are the 'hotheads' and 'outsiders' who are stirring up the less-sophisticated black citizens who have been content with their place and wanting no change. A few exceptional Negro children may have outstanding potential and these should be encouraged. But the schools, even if integrated, could do little for the others whose low level of culture, if not basic inferiority, will require generations to change if it can be changed at all. To do anything special, or even equal, for Negroes would mean shortchanging other groups of pupils, [he means the white middle-class kids], weakening the whole public school system."

> I've been told not long ago, "Why can't these [civil rights] people get together and reach a common agreement? Why is there so much dissension, so much tension, so much conflict?" This attitude toward minority groups is part of the luxury of being in a majority. We think we have the right to expect everyone in a minority to agree. Haven't they the same right to be part of a broad spectrum with different ideas, different attitudes, different values, different conclusions about social problems? This really, too, is a form of perhaps unconscious discrimination in which we want to impose a monolithic attitude response on the minority groups which we never expect of ourselves.
>
> —Hon. Justine Wise Polier, March 14, 1964

On some boards, however, the "bitter-ender" is reaching his own bitter end. He is being replaced by men with less rigid attitudes who realize that something must be done to

correct at least the most glaring inequities. The "bitter-ender" is replaced, not changed; he leaves the board feeling no differently about the integration issue than he did at the time when his private attitudes were translated into public policy. The replacement of the "bitter-ender" is essential since his own rigidities prevent change. The instrument for that is politics whether the board be appointive or elective.

The extent to which school personnel should participate in the politics of education is a difficult question, particularly when it comes to eliminating or adding members of the school board. However, it seems to me quite consistent for school personnel to stand firmly on professional principles and on public law, indicating quite clearly what is implied in the position of the "bitter-ender" on the integration issue. However, the critical political initiative wll probably have to be taken by the education-denied groups themselves if the "bitter-ender" is to be overcome. They have not only just a right but also an obligation to judge school board members and to act on their conclusions. The minimum response of school personnel to such groups should include providing the widest possible range of official data and full and continuous consultation with their representatives.

The attitude of the conservative school board member is not to be confused with that of the "bitter-ender." The conservative is not a bigot and he is not to be identified with those who call themselves conservatives but behave in the most radical and irresponsible manner with respect to public education and other issues. The conservative board member is open minded; he has a decent regard for the facts and recognizes the reality of social change and the emergence of new social problems. He does not believe, however, that substantial changes in race relations in education can be achieved within a short time or that they can result from the systematic efforts of school boards and school personnel to bring them about. He tends to emphasize the hold of tradition and the substantially irrational elements in the behavior of most people, especially in race relations.

The conservative is also likely to be quite cautious about public school costs. With his social conservatism goes economic conservatism. He may accept an essentially bold integration program if its cost is "reasonable," meaning small. Unfortunately, there is no cut-rate program for integrated education. It is expensive; there is little point in arguing that the necessary tasks can be accomplished without substantially more reseurces than are currently available. I believe school personnel must make this point emphatically, especially with concerned conservatives who fear deficits much more than they fear desegregation.

The concerned conservative's attitude can be influenced by fact and by logic and by an appeal to his sense of community responsibility. He is likely to view with considerable distaste, however, some civil rights organizations—their demands and their methods of securing them. But he does not kid himself, and his own decency soon comes to the fore. He knows that the cry of "Red" and "Communist" is a substitute for neither an analysis of racial injustice in American society nor an adequate education program for millions of Negro children. Above all, the conservative knows that one does not escape moral responsibility by pious, self-serving incantations or by falsely labeling those who remind him of his shortcomings.

Many school personnel should feel comfortable with the concerned conservative for their attitudes are highly similar. With him they feel that something can be done on the integration issue but not so much as to upset the "neighborhood school" pattern or to shift school boundaries drastically or to introduce bold programs of compensatory education that would substantially alter the long established curriculum. (Parenthetically, one wonders just how even the most uninformed and irresponsible critic of public schools could accuse their personnel of "radicalism.")

The administration-dominated school board member is another type with which most of you are familiar. His position on integration is no "position" at all; that is to say he embodies a kind of vacuous fluidity. On this and other issues he takes his cues from the key administrator, usually the Superintendent, who is quick to recognize the man's possible usefulness, and in time probably his patent liabilities. The administration-dominated type is either too lazy or too timid to form an independent position. He sees it not as a public trust but as a private opportunity. School board membership is essentially a means to a higher goal, for basking in the local limelight or stepping upward to another public office. His chief concern is to make no serious mistakes, offend no important group, and avoid being labeled controversial. He believes these aims can best be served by close identification with the chief administrator on whose support he can count in exchange for uncritical loyalty.

The key to the attitude of the administration-dominated type is not the man himself but the administrator who wields a determining influence on his behavior as a board member. The administrator-dominated man has a great deal of faith in "experts" and "specialists," not only to evaluate and carry out policies but to devise them initially. Indeed, he sees the board's function essentially as approving administrative proposals and "interpreting" them to the public.

The response of this type to integration proposals is predictable if the attitudes of the administrators are known. School personnel come to realize this in time by watching board members and administrators consider a series of issues. Those outside the the official system soon learn that integrated programs cannot be initiated through the administration-dominated board member. Much time and energy can be saved if the focus is shifted quickly to the people who count, the powerful administrators.

The attitudes of liberal-type board members are more diffuse than the three considered above. Liberals agree that segregated education exists, is undesirable, and that school boards have a responsibility for eliminating it. The question is how—in what length of time, with what means, and at what costs? One finds surprising diversity in responses of liberal types; civil rights leaders frequently are startled at the hesitancy of liberals on specific issues that must be faced if integration is to proceed. The liberal type by nature is peculiarly concerned with method, with the consistency of the several available means with long-term goals and basic values. The integration advocate understandably emphasizes goals and is not greatly disturbed if means for attaining them do not always mesh neatly. To the liberal type, who is usually white, the integration advocate's attitude suggests an unbecoming single-mindedness, possibly "extremism," which he fears will endanger the "progress" being made. To the advocate the liberal's preoccupation with method is a mark of weakness, a lack of courage in facing the logical implications of a basic value position and the personal implications, including status, of integrated education.

The liberal-type board member, like so many other whites, is frequently only vagely aware of what is going on in the Negro community. He is not particularly sensitive to the changing collective mood of Negroes and its meaning for their spokesmen to the white community. The integration advocate, on the other hand, fails to understand the limited influence of the liberal board members, who are probably in a minority, and who must work within the framework of an established system that includes many built-in resistances to changes—of any kind.

The liberal type, of course, is a natural to introduce integration measures. Other board members cannot help becoming aware of growing unrest among Negroes and their demands for equal education chances. A certain anxiety has developed in those school boards with which I am familiar; it is likely to increase in the near future. There will develop a situation in which integration

proposals will be viewed more hopefully. The liberal, with specific measures in hand, can then move boldly with some change of success; at least he will get a serious hearing.

The four types of board members identified by basic attitudes toward integration are rarely found in pure form. Typologies are useful not because of their symmetry but because they enable us to understand the attitudes of school board members and their bearing on public school integration in specific communities.

The problems of integrated education will challenge school boards across the land for many years to come. Whether elected or appointed, board members will have to confront the harsh facts and issues; there is no easy way out. The board members' attitudes and competencies for this issue should be crucial in their selection. School professionals can instruct board members on many aspects of integration; wiser decisions, hopefully, will be the outcome.

ADMINISTRATORS

On turning to administrative personnel we find a wide range of specialists functioning within varying school systems. Regarding integration, however, there are a few fairly distinct attitudinal types. There is the actively hostile administrator who may have many reasons for being so. Though personal prejudice is at the core, it may be that he fears integrated programs because they are beyond his training and capacity to handle; his failure would mar an otherwise successful professional career. Or he fears that such programs will cause all kinds of internal staff disruptions, even if they do not create additional public relations problems. Or he may feel that introducing such programs is yielding to public pressures and compromising the autonomy of school administrators. Implicit in this attitude is the assumption that neither board members nor spokesmen of education-denied minorities really know what is good for them or for the schools.

My impression is that this type is on the way out. In some communities, however, such administrators are so well entrenched in school system and power structure that they cannot be forced out. Some are changing, not enthusiastically, but nevertheless changing. One superintendent of my acquaintance within a space of three years shifted his position from outright opposition to integration ("To hell with the Supreme Court; I work for the School Board.") to studied support of a broad program of integration for Negroes and Mexican-Americans. Another is engaged in extensive reading and consultations with social scientists in the nearby university preparatory to initiating a new program this fall. I do not

> Because so many white leaders in the North—political, business, and educators, to be explicit, do not correctly estimate the fact of a revolutionary movement in our midst, they employ essentially the same tactics that southern white leaders apply when the pressure builds, and an explosion occurs. They exert police power to put down disorder. They refuse to negotiate with the real leaders of the movement. They denounce "irresponsible" leadership, and the battle lines are drawn.
> What is most desperately needed right now is for some real search for peaceful alternatives on the part of the white power structure in northern cities.
> It will take extraordinary efforts. Boards of education are unable to initiate the kind of program that will be required to meet the school crisis arising in all of the major cities. Political captivity on the part of the board members, and educational and theoretical rigidity on the part of the school administrators conspire to prevent any drastic changes in school systems. So the whole problem settles down to arrogant defiance of legitimate protest or giving in a little here or there.
> It will take action on the part of the highest civil authority . . .
>
> —Rev. Robert W. Spike, executive director, Commission on Religion and Race, National Council of Churches, May 4, 1964

attempt to assess the motives for such changes. The results are more important, and perhaps even the most hostile administrator can be pressured into a substantially new behavioral mold.

The chances for avoiding selection of hostile types will be greatly improved if teacher training institutions screen applicants more carefully, weighing attitudes about race and ethnic minorities. Further, it will be essential to provide training and experience that will reinforce suitable attitudes and equip officials to express them effectively.

The indifferent administrator is a type whose numbers are shrinking rapidly. Nevertheless one still finds him in key positions in school systems in which the integration issue must be raised sooner or later. The indifferent type thinks that he will be relatively untouched. Even when there are storm clouds on the horizon, he looks the other way. His lack of knowledge about the Negro community has produced a myopia that blurs the deep feelings and growing needs of frustrated Negro parents and children. By training, and by temperament too, the indifferent administrator is poorly equipped to deal with integration questions. He does not actively seek out minority spokesmen to gain useful information; he does not initiate staff studies to gauge the degree of discrimination in the system; he would not even consider drafting a plan to eliminate inequities. Usually, then, he is caught flatfooted by the demands of Negro organizations. And his reactions, at least initially, only worsen the situation. His lack of concern about minority children can only anger parents who see the inferior education of their offspring as grossly inadequate and a permanent blight on their career chances.

The indifferent type is apt to exclaim: "I can't see what you people (Negroes) are so excited about." The problem then becomes one of how to open his eyes and where to cast the light. The indifferent's subordinates may be in a good position to help, provided they are not also equally unenlightened and unaffected. They can at least describe the racial inequities in the system. Particularly are school principals in a position to underscore the issues. Within the school, teachers and counselors can look for underlying causes of minority pupil failure and trouble. Why should it be necessary for indifferent administrators to be aroused by court orders, boycotts, mass protests and other direct action remedies, rather than by their own professional staff members?

In contrast to the hostile and indifferent administrative types are two others who want to do something about segregation but who differ in understanding, approach, and emphasis. The first is the "cautious conformist." His attitude is one of fear mingled with a certain guilt about denial of equal access to education. Typically he lacks familiarity with concrete issues, with developments in other communities, with moods of Negroes with whom he has had little or no association. There are few minority pupils now in his district or system. Privately he is relieved that they are concentrated elsewhere.

With so many changes taking place in race relations and education, the cautious conformist cannot rest comfortably. He knows that the issue will one day, sooner or later, confront him. As much as he would like to do so, he cannot simply wait, hoping the time will be long and the confrontation minor. He is moved to some degree by a sense of both professional and personal responsibility. He may initiate inquiries and perhaps develop tentative plans for dealing with the issue. Like the boy scout, he wants to be prepared; unlike the scout, he is not very venturesome.

This type displays attitudes with which you are familiar. You recognize, too, that they have considerable potential for effective integration efforts. The cautious conformist's behavior is a result not only of his personal ambiguities but also of the play of powerful cross-pressures which cannot easily be sorted out and reconciled. Pressures from some white parents, businessmen and rightist political organizations are for him quite real and persistent. Unless they are countered by civil

rights organizations with ideas and plans as well as pressures, the cautious conformist will be slow to move. In this administrator, weakness and wisdom are extremely difficult to isolate. Attitudes at the personal level are quite decent; this must be understood by those who would change his behavior. He can only be alienated by those who interpret caution as meaningless hostility or bureaucratic evasion.

The last of the four types is that *rara avis*, the enthusiastic integrator. He believes changes can come rapidly, even though he knows how slowly bureaucratic wheels customarily turn. He is, let's face it, a minority among administrators. Usually he is younger, more sensitized to the issue, having grown to maturity while integrated education was becoming a large and persistent public issue. Some of his training has at least touched on the problem and perhaps suggested how it can be dealt with. Though youthfulness is no guarantee of an administrator's favorable attitudes, it helps. The young administrator is encountering new challenges before getting "fixed" on controversial issues in school and community.

The enthusiastic integrator must tangle with the established bureaucratic types whose main concerns are organizational stability and risk avoidance. He may lack knowledge of the ins-and-outs of the bureaucratic structure and of the sentiments and resources of minority communities. The first he will under-estimate and the second he will over-value. He will irritate his associates and evoke mixed reactions from his superiors. However, his enthusiasm itself can be persuasive to the ambivalent and hesitant and it can carry him a considerable distance against outside pressures.

The enthusiast's basic attitudes are quite sound. It is important that they be reinforced by those sharing his goals. He will be strengthened if his effort receives favorable professional and public recognition. For his own career he needs support through promotion, salary increases, and greater responsibilities, possibly direction of a program attacking segregation within the whole system. The "enthusiast" is not the opposite of "realist." It is grossly unfair and question-begging to characterize him as "impractical" or "theoretical" while those who do nothing and prefer bureaucratic comforts are praised as "practical and realistic men who know their business."

There are other attitudinal types within the administrative personnel group. Essentially they are variants of the four already considered; they will not be described at this point.

TEACHERS

Board members and administrators are key personnel in developing policies and structures for racial desegregation of public schools. But desegregation is not integration; the latter is essential for genuine equality of educational opportunty. Integration depends on practicing administrators, teachers and counselors carrying out day-to-day tasks in desegregated schools with personal conviction and professional commitment. Of special importance are the attitudes of teachers which we shall next explore in brief typological fashion. (Although the attitudes of counseling and guidance personnel are highly relevant, we will not have time to consider them in any detail.)

Two keys to the attitudes of teachers are their feelings about teaching as a profession and about social status. Those of you familiar with teacher responses to educational inequalities and to desegregation can recall convincing examples of each type to be described. My classification is based on wide observation and on systematic interviewing over a long period of time in widely varying situations.

One finds some teachers, like board members and administrators, indifferent to integrated education. The indifferent teacher will not be concerned either with race or with other issues in the school and in the profession. For him teaching is a means of obtaining money and time for pursuit of other interests. Status in the profession is not important and he has no great concern with colleague opinion as long as it does not endanger his job (not profession) and income.

> That [busing to redress racial imbalance] is a highly controversial subject in my State. Personally I believe the [better] part of wisdom is not to do it. I believe it would be wiser to attempt judiciously to redraw school district boundaries, without gerrymandering, so that there would be a number of Negroes as well as whites within each school district.
>
> —Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, April 8, 1964

His ideas about education are limited; he is concerned to get through day-to-day tasks with minimum effort and trouble. Social status concerns are not compelling; his "kicks" come from indulgence of highly individualized interests. He has no yard stick for measuring one education problem against another. De facto segregation is accepted where it is found; inequities do not strike him as important since education has a low place in his scheme of things. His attitude is neither hostile nor favorable.

He will accept change from segregated to desegregated schools as a matter of course; he will not initiate changes or offer something new for making desegregated classrooms integrated learning communities. He lacks enthusiasm for subject matter and the drive to share it with others, especially with groups with stunted learning motivations.

The indifferent teacher has no animated objections to a desegregated classroom; he will work in "depressed areas" if more money is available and working conditions not particularly objectionable. His basic attitude is not likely to be changed, because he is insensitive to professional pressures and social issues. One may ask why he became a teacher in the first place. But there are a great many of this type in today's public schools; more will join the ranks in spite of better screening norms.

The frightened teacher, for the time being, can contribute no more to integrated education than the indifferent one. He usually comes from a white middle-class background and has had little contact with Negroes.

Familiarity need not produce acceptance, but isolation from the culturally different does produce misgivings and unwarranted fear. The frightened teacher is not necessarily concerned with social status. He is uncertain about coping with new situations, especially those with deep emotional overtones and conflict potentials. His limited awareness of racial and ethnic minorities, largely untested, can be no source of comfort. On the one hand he proposes to "treat all students alike" and on the other he emphasizes the disparities suggested by test scores and performance reports. Adding to his fears are the usual stories and rumors about dire happenings in other schools where desegregation has occurred or is being attempted. Although no desegregation effort about which I know has come off smoothly, much of the experience should reassure the frightened teacher.

This frightened type is concerned not only with doing an effective job but also with his personal dignity and safety in those schools where social disorganization is high and outside conflicts are carried into the classroom. Such anxieties may come to dominate the teachers' outlook and prevent his tackling the instructional task at hand. Then, even the most favorable attitude toward integration as such will be over-ridden, and the teacher's positive contribution lost.

The task here is not one of changing attitudes but of providing those conditions within which the frightened teacher can relax and go about his business. Above all, he must be kept in the school and in the profession; potentially he can make an essential contribution.

The status-striving teacher is also frightened but not for the same reasons. For him teaching is not only a professional activity but also one of the few available means for climbing the social ladder. Teaching is selected because it ranks high in the values of the lower middle-class from which the status striver is likely to come and because it is within relatively easy reach as a career. It is

not looked upon as a calling or simply as a means of making money. It is an instrument for upward social mobility; if it fails to serve this function, it will be abandoned.

Integrated education is a serious threat to the status striver. He shares the racial antipathies of lower middle class whites; his own ancestors, immigrants perhaps, are likely to have been poorly rated in the community. His ideal is assignment in an all white middle-cass or upper-class school in a suburban community. There he can live as well as work, being recognized as much for what he has and can publicly display as for what he is.

For him avoidance of conflict on public issues is part of conforming behavior leading to social acceptance and confirming hard-won status. He defines the integration issue as controversial and the integrated school situation as threatening. Mixed schools, he concludes, are made up primarily of low-strata people and minorities; to work in them is to endanger social striver self-image and status. An admission of Negro children to his previously all white school will disturb him. He will as quietly as possible transfer to remaining segregated schools or get out of the system altogether.

If he remains, he will not be very effective since he cannot accept the situation as socially comfortable. This is not to say he is hopeless. He can be influenced by subsequent developments. His preoccupation with status may be reduced. More recognition in the profession precisely for good work in integrated programs will help.

Special counseling and guidance in handling the status-striving teacher in integrated situations will reduce the likelihood of status panic.

We should not minimize the strong social status concerns of many teachers, white and Negro, and their implications for integrated education programs. These teachers can be a cause of low morale and create serious staff disruptions. We should carefully identify those whose status anxieties preclude their doing an effective job, and we should take measures to change or redirect their attitudes.

The custodian type of teacher aims primarily at maintaining order and exercising authority. He is not able to make his subject the focus of pupil attention. Possibly at one time he was enthusiastic about teaching, but prolonged service in a school composed primarily of lower class and undisciplined pupils has led him to minimize education and to emphasize control.

He gets some satisfaction from exercise of effective custody and is wise in its ways and skilled in keeping the lid on.

He feels that little can be done for racial and ethnic minority pupils because of a depressing acquaintance with them, their parents, associates and the communities in which they live. His attitude is one of weary acceptance of the handicaps his pupils face in breaking the vicious cycle of poverty, poor education, and unemployment. His own demoralization conveys itself to his charges who sense that he has for them no more hope than other adults in their narrow world. The custodian attitude can result from a particular need to impose order and certainty on ambiguous— and dangerous—situations. This, however, is a matter on which the psychologist is probably best equipped to comment.

As a sociologist I offer two observations: first, the custodian type can get a fresh perspective by being removed for a time from the slum school and encountering new situations. Second, he has a wealth of valuable experience on which other school personnel can draw and can take professional pride in making it available to them. His attitude will be improved by teaching in different schools, offsetting the demanding uniformities of single race, single class institutions.

The secular missionary teacher differs sharply from the custodian type. Contrary to the title's suggestion, he is not the most effective teacher for integrated education programs. Because of a deep sense of mission toward members of racial and ethnic

minorities, he will seek opportunities to work with them in community and classroom. His kind of "acceptance," however, is not altogether genuine.

His paternalistic attitude marks the Negro's presumed inferiority in a less harsh but just as emphatic a way. (And if there is one thing the Negro today does not want, it is to be patronized by well-meaning uplifters. He wants respect and he is determined to create those conditions under which it may be gained.)

The secular missionary wants to change converts into something fairly specific not to simply equip them to find their own way among a number of alternatives. Particularly where Negroes are concerned he fails to understand the values and sentiments.

As a consequence he ignores, even insults, their sense of self-worth. So-called "culturally deprived" Negroes do not necessarily think of themselves as being deprived of or requiring uplift by some self-appointed helper. (They know that they are education-denied, but that is something quite different.) The same is true for other minorities who see the missionary, secular or otherwise, as much as cause and reminder of their plight as cure for it. The secular missionary's insistence on his own righteousness alienates his associates who feel less worthy in dealing with integrated education issues.

This type can play a worthwhile role by emphasizing segregation issues and providing an example of intense concern. However, unless his attitudes are modified, he will not be effective in the day-to-day integrated setting.

He will substitute moral exhortation for subject matter exposition and focus more on overt form and manners than on the basic topics at hand. The secular missionary must be approached cautiously, especially if he has come lately to the cause. None is so holy or likely to fall from grace so soon.

> Cities with high levels of residential segregation cannot be compared with cities with really low levels, because there are no examples of the latter.
>
> —Karl Taeuber, 1964

One other type of teacher whose attitude, in my view, merits more recognition is the teacher's teacher, the professional's professional. He sees his primary task as public service based on competence acquired through training and carried out with standards that are publicly explicit and personally internalized. He interprets de facto segregation in light of its bearing on professional goals. He is keenly aware of those conditions, including race relations which bear on the profession's fulfilling its essential objective. And he sees the organized profession of teaching as something more than a trade union preoccupied with wages, hours, and working conditions.

Both the problems of desegregation and integration he views primarily as the responsibility of professionally competent administrators and teachers, with school boards laying down only the broadest policies and providing the resources essential to equaling learning chances. He may not be widely experienced with minority peoples but he can convey confidence by his approach, and a sense that for him race in the classroom is not important.

The professional type is interested in the subject matter he professes and in the conditions essential to imparting knowledge to his pupils. He has discovered that his eagerness to teach it carries a long way even among the so-called "culturally deprived" who are supposed to have little intellectual interest or academic potential. The professional type can be extremely valuable in two ways: he can give a steady focus on the ultimate goals of the education enterprise, and he can provide minority pupils a better sense of their own worth by his faith in their ability to learn.

COUNSELORS

It was my intention initially to examine the changing attitudes of school counselors toward integration for that is a group I have had opportunity to study in some detail. My failure to give more attention to counselors is not because I regard

them as minor players in the integration drama. They can and, no doubt, will play bigger roles as school after school seeks to use its total resources to deal with integration problems.

Briefly, school counselors can be divided into a half dozen or so fairly distinct groups: (1) the administration-bound counselor who is concerned primarily with institutional administrative aspects of counseling and regards himself as an administrator or potential administrator; (2) the amateur psychologist counselor who sees his role as clinician serving clients and the problems of integration as individual psychological issues; (3) the "adjustment" counselor who emphasizes the importance of the individual "accepting" the limits of his situation and fitting into it as best he can, which for the Negro child means de facto segregation; (4) the off-beat counselor who rejects many of the values of the dominant white society, including its racist values, and has sympathy and understanding for others who have in another sense been rejected; (5) the authoritarian counselor who is both morally and intellectually rigid and lacking in understanding of minority student sensibilities and who relies primarily an moral admonition in dealing with integration; (6) the jet-propelled counselor who has emerged in recent years primarily as a manpower recruiter for the military and space industry and whose central question for all individuals is: can you build a better bomb or fly to the moon? The detailed components of those types have been considered elsewhere.

IV

Throughout this paper, I have, directly or by implication, suggested steps for defining and changing attitudes of school personnel toward integration. In concluding I wish to suggest some additional measures.

School boards may require some basic changes in form and composition before any effective measures can be taken. This is essentially a broad public and political task on which other school personnel are unable to act directly. However, school personnel are organized; as members of professions and as employees of school systems they do have influence. They can encourage desegregation by developing concrete proposals and by pushing for their adoption. The pose of powerlessness on this issue is at least partially false and it is certainly unbecoming. Knowing the structure and types of members of school boards is essential to effective intervention at the board level. More, I hope can be said on this matter later.

Regarding administrators, it is again important that we recognize the wide range of types and attitudes among them. First, it is essential to understand the system and their roles in it. The limits of their authority and resources, as well as their potentials for integrated education, need careful definition. Much more studied selection of administrative personnel, with emphasis on ability to develop integrated programs, is a growing need. Backing up, we need a critical review and modification of administrative curricula in teacher training intergroup relations and on specific institutions. Greater emphasis on problems of race relations in schools is an essential but only partial corrective. Backing up still further, we need a keener selection of students for training in school administration.

> What is the value of integrating our students if we, their teachers and administrators, remain as segregated as ever?
>
> —Francis Keppel, August 3, 1964

Heretofore there has been little concern for basic attitudes toward racial and ethnic minorities as a measure of fitness. These attitudes should now be emphasized. More support, technical and moral, for administrators dealing constructively with integration issues is essential. The responsibility of professional organizations here, it seems to me, is quite clear. In the immediate circumstances emergency special or in-service training in race relations for all administrators in a system is highly desirable although not all of them are presently directly

affected by integration conflicts. Elimination of certain types of administrators from present positions or even from the system entirely may be essential. This is a possibility that must be faced squarely.

With respect to the attitudes of teachers some useful steps can be taken immediately. Teacher organizations can drop their extreme caution and broaden their concern about school and community issues. They can insist that members in integration situations adhere to professional principles; they can actively support those teachers who are making a contribution—with protection and with affirmative suggestions.

> Now, basically, racial imbalance in any community comes because of school district lines.
>
> —Secretary Anthony Celebrezze, July 10, 1963

The importance of careful selection of teacher trainees cannot be exaggerated. We should not ask that they be free of bias or that they be fervently committed to integrated education. But we must insist that they hold no unchangeable attitudes that are basically at odds with professional standards and incompatible with the purposes of public education in a democracy. With careful selection of trainees should go revisions of the curricula they are required to complete. Revision should aim at acquainting the future teacher with the background and character of contemporary race relations; moreover, sustained, first-hand encounter with racial and ethnic minorities in school and community settings must be added.

For those teachers already established in school systems a program of information on developments relating to integration is a minimal need.

Boards and administrators as well as teacher organizations have a heavy responsibility here. Attitudes are likely to be more flexible if the teacher has had access to a continuing flow of information which the school system itself makes available. Specific changes can be anticipated and those affected can have time to "get used" to them. In-service training, not "informational" but in depth, would be an even better way for making up the deficiencies in knowledge and for interpreting more recent developments.

Having said much elsewhere about counselors, I shall say little here except to insist again that more counselors are needed but not more of some of the types to which I have referred briefly. We need counselors with deep sensitivity to individual frailties and potentials, but we need as well those who are able to see the personal frailties in the context of community and social problems, who can mark the difference between an individual problem and a social disorder.

In sum, attitudes of school personnel are not easily changed, but they are not irretrievably fixed. To facilitate integration in public schools, educators should identify those attitudes and seek to modify them, or at least redirect their expression if they are detrimental to public principles of equal education opportunity.

To those of us here, and I hope to many others, the court decision of 1954 was more than a legal opinion. It was a moral challenge; its application by educators requires more than fulfilling bureaucratic obligation or rendering technical service. Education itself in the final analysis is a moral enterprise, and the education of all to realization of their fullest potential is the great moral obligation we, as teachers, cannot escape.

> In the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag we intone, "One Nation, under God." And so it is. It is an integrated Nation. Air, rail, and highway transportation make it so. A common language makes it so. A tax pattern which applies equally to white and nonwhite makes it so.
>
> —Senator Everett M. Dirksen, June 10, 1964